DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 951 EA 007 144

AUTHOR	McVeigh, Thomas
TITLE	Social Indicators: A Bibliography. Exchange Bibliography No. 215.
INSTITUTION	Council of Planning Librarians, Monticello, Ill.
PUB DATE	Sep 71
NOTE	47p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Planning Librarians, P. O. Box 229, Monticello, Illinois 61856 ($4.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Annotated Bibliographies; Information Systems; Models; Publications; *Reference Materials; Social Characteristics; Social Factors; Social Welfare; *Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociometric Techniques; *Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Social Indicators

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography lists a variety of publications dealing with the general subject of social indicators. Entries are organized into a number of separate sections dealing with such topics as relevant legislation; general information surveys; health, education, and welfare surveys; mental health surveys; natural resources surveys; housing and urban development surveys; specific aspects and problems of social indicators; partial systems of social indicators; general systems of social indicators; and societal models. Within each section, citation are listed alphabetically by author's name. A short appendix presents an unannotated list of publications cited as references in one or more of the publications included in the annotated entries. (JG)

ED106951

Council of Planning Librarians EXCHANGE BIBLIOGRAPHY

September 1971

215

SOCIAL INDICATORS: A Bibliography

Thomas McVeigh, Social Planner

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EA 007 144

Mrs. Mary Vance, Editor
Post Office Box 229
Monticello, Illinois 61856

Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography #215

SOCIAL INDICATORS

Compiled and annotated by Thomas McVeigh,
Social Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

page

I. General References ---------- 15
A. Legislation ---------- 19

II. Information Surveys
A. General ---------- 21
B. Health, Education and Welfare ---------- 25
C. Mental Health ---------- 28
D. Natural Resources ---------- 29
E. Housing and Urban Development ---------- 30

III. Social Indicators
A. Specific Aspects and Problems ---------- 31
B. Partial Systems ---------- 34

IV. Social Indicators

A. General Systems ---------- 37
B. Societal Models ---------- 42

V. Appendix -- Non-annotated Bibliography ---------- 44

INTRODUCTION

The past decade saw the rediscovery of poverty* in America, the subsequent involvement of the federal government in areas once passionately shunned, and a general awakening by the American public that the American way of life was no longer synonomous with the concepts and ideals which collectively became known as the "quality of life." Moreover, it was finally admitted on a national scale that the American way of life had, for a significant portion of the population, never been synonomous with anything even remotely approaching the qualify of life.

This concern for some future quality has drawn many different responses among the population. Some, believing that the past was a time of peace, community and creativity, have rejected modern society entirely and are attempting to reconstruct their vision of the past in some isolated and pastoral setting. One has to admire these individuals for their attempts to actualize their ideals, but, at this time, it seems unfortunately true that their idealism of the present is exceeded only by their ignorance of the past. Others have espoused the opposite extreme that technology, which has created or at least contributed to many of the present sorry conditions of American life, will solve these same conditions, thus ushering in, for the first time in history, an everlasting period truly worthy of the phrase, the quality of life. They are correct in their belief that technology has the capacity to solve many of this country's problems, but err on the side of naivete in

*In this paper, poverty is taken to include all of those conditions of human existence which are antithetical to the quality of life. It thus goes far beyond the usual basic definition of economic deprivation.

believing that this capacity will be put to that end by the powerful technocracy in this country, who, after all, have utilized technology so far in such a way as to cause many of the existing social problems.

As always, two extremes enclose a middle or intermediate position. In this case, there are innumerable middle positions, for it is here that one will find the manifestations of the past decade's involvement by the federal government in this pursuit of the quality of life, that is, the vast number of federal programs in the areas of education, housing, health, anit-poverty, urban planning, and so forth; here one will find the huge volume of research concerning the urban affairs of this country; and here, too, one will find almost all of the newly organized community and citizens groups which have formed to achieve certain goals for themselves.

The subject of this bibliography is also to be found in this middle area. In fact, social indicators are involved to varying degrees in practically every division of this middle area. The governmental and research sectors have different needs, different approaches and different objectives with respect to social indicators, but each is certainly interested in the development of such measures. Each has contributed to the present state of the art of social reporting and accounting and, in order to understand what social indicators are and what they can do, it will be helpful, even necessary, to determine the reasons for the interest that each has shown in social indicators. In short, before we can address the question of what are social indicators, we must answer the question, why social indicators?

WHY SOCIAL INDICATORS?

THE NEED

As both the federal government and the indicator researchers became increasingly concerned and involved in the pursuit of this quality of life, information about the present conditions of life in America for all segments of the population and in all its aspects began to be collected on a scale never before attempted. It was hardly surprising that much of the information considered vital to this pursuit was unavailable or in such an unsystematic state that it was meaningless. For, in years past, poverty was thought to be the result of personal fault or the vengeance of a just deity or some similar nonsense. The existence of the so-called cycle of poverty was taken without much questioning as proof of the validity of these beliefs. Accordingly, because these beliefs permeated the power bases of America---the government in the political arena and the university in the intellectual---, questions concerning the American way of life were never considered in a significant way, that is, in a way which could yield the facts.

But, beginning in the early sixties, the possibility of this complacency's continued existence was destroyed. The catalyst for this was most probably the publication of Michael Harrington's The Other America. Suddenly the federal government discovered that it had next to nothing in the way of usable and meaningful statistics on the number of poor people in this country or the magnitude of causes of their poverty. It was discovered and grudgingly admitted by the federal government and by the social scientists that almost no statistically usable and useful information was available concerning this "other America." And it was also realized that this information was sorely needed. The government

was beginning to mount its huge program against poverty, but was faced with the dilemma of laying out large sums of money (or so it seemed at the time: this was before the large-scale American operation in Southeast Asia and before the spending practices of the Defense Department were publically revealed) in programs that could only realistically be thought of as experiments into the unknown. The social scientists, because they saw their role as contributors to the knowledge and understanding of society, its parts, and its operation, found that they had been excluding from their work a large portion of this society; in fact, one whose predominant characteristic set them distinctlyapart from the rest of the society. Both the federal government and the social scientists set out to rectify these situations.

Information in the forms of surveys of the poor, interviews, analyses of the history of the poor and of specific events, studies of the institutions with which the poor, by reason of their poverty, had to deal, all of these were started and completed on a vast scale and at a very fast pace. But, as the information continued to be amassed and analyzed, it became clear that gaps still existed. The most obvious need was some way in which to order all of this new data. It would greatly enhance the usefulness of the data already collected and that being collected if there was some standard methodology: because there was not, data often could not be evaluated as to its worth and checked as to its reliability without repeating the collection using a different method.

All of this uncoordinated information approached a detailed and reliable picture of the state of America, but neither the government nor the social scientists could state with any conviction that this picture was as accurate as it could be. The first need, therefore, which was

shared by both the government and the social scientists, was for some ordering mechanism which would enable them to coordinate all of this data at hand so that they could, with a suitable amount of accuracy and reliability, answer the question of where this nation was with respect to the criteria and standards embodied in the quality of life. In short, what was needed was a method of utilizing existing data so that a social report of the nation could be given which would avoid the inherent limitations of the President's State of the Union Message which was, and is, largely an economic picture of the nation.

Simultaneously with the recognition of this first need was the realization by both the government and the social scientists that the setting of policies and priorities would be even more difficult in this area of the quality of life than it usually is in the democratic and pluralistic process. For one thing, there were very few concrete standards associated with the quality of life which were agreeable to all the parties concerned with policy formation and priority setting. Indeed, the quality of life has still not been defined in such a way as to lead to a consensus among the people involved in its achievement.

The limited resources available to this pursuit made it mandatory that they be utilized in the most efficient and effective manner. Of course, the fact that resources for this area were limited told much about the existing priorities of the federal government, for the only area of government activity which did not appear to be limited in its resources was defense. For the most part, this limitation on available resources was accepted as a fact of life by government personnel interested in pursuing the quality of life, and, on the part of the social scientists, while their voices and pens were not silent concerning these existing priorities, their power to effect immediate reordering was negligible.

At any rate, resources were limited; conditions were deplorable; and solutions were urgently needed. The questions which had to be answered were: (1) Where do we want to go? Or stated differently, what is the quality of life? and (2) Where do we begin, recognizing that we cannot do everything which is absolutely necessary to achieve the quality of life? What policy and what order of priorities will have the greatest effects, the greatest ramifications throughout the country in destroying poverty and in creating an American way of life which is synonomous with the quality of life for all Americans?

Although there was much communication among government and social science personnel, there also existed a different emphasis and approach to searching for these answers. The government personnel, for the most part, were more aware of the political implications of their efforts against poverty. And the political ramifications of the anti-poverty programs were far-reaching and, usually, not very encouraging. The social scientists, on the other hand, could ignore in their research and writings these implications to a much greater degree. Thus, the effect of these different emphases and approaches was that the findings of the social scientists---the more accurate ones---would usually be toned down by the government in order to bring about some measure of political approval. Their orientation appeared to be that anything was better than nothing. This, of course, is true, but the "anything" achieved in the political arena usually fell far short of the recommendations of the social scientists and, more importantly, of the rising expectations of the poor.

The second need, then, was like the first shared by both the government and social science personnel. It involved the formation of

policies to direct the pursuit of the quality of life and the setting of priorities for these policies and for action due to the limited resources available to social programs and research. Standards had to be set which, when taken collectively, would be the quality of life. Based on the information at hand (which, if ordered, would describe the present state of the nation), decisions about what was desired as future states of the nation had to be made. But the criteria with which to make these decisions was not in the arsenal of tools of the government and the social scientists.

The third need was largely an administrative one and therefore was more the concern of government personnel than the social scientists. For, once a program was conceived and the process of implementation begun, measures of assessing its impact on the problem it was designed to alleviate or solve were wholly inadequate. The inauguration of planning-programming-budgeting, first in the Department of Defense and subsequently throughout all agencies of the federal government, was an attempt to remedy this inadequacy, but because it was limited in its application to predominantly economic considerations, PPBS served to accentuate the need for more comprehensive measures. The philosophical and political realities of the three administrations involved up to the present in this pursuit of the quality of life caused this administrative need to revolve around three major considerations in attempting to evaluate a program. In order of importance to these administrators, these three were economy, efficiency and effectiveness. While all three of these should be incorporated into any evaluation methodology, the pre-existing priority given to them by the federal government (for all the wrong reasons, if one's main concern is the improvement of the quality of American life) differs from that which most of the social scientists would advocate.

The three needs can be summarized by asking three questions: "Where are we now?"; "Where do we want to be at some future time?"; and "How do we want to go from this present to that future?" The gaps in the information necessary to answer each question have been discussed from the perspectives of the two parties most involved in them, namely the federal government and the social scientists. For the most part, the concerns of these two are compatible and complimentary. As the state of the nation changes, however, with concomitant rises in expectations, this situation may change. The government has a more short-term perspective than the social scientists, for it is primarily interested in better programs in the future and better operation of existing programs. The social scientists, however, place their emphasis on the development and implementation of a general system of measures which will satisfy the existing needs left by the present system (if it can be so dignified by the term). It seems likely that the goal of the government will be reached before that of the social scientists and, if this occurs, the social scientists will be faced with the task of convincing the federal government that more must still be done. The example of the economic indicators presently used by the federal government does not give one much hope in this regard, for it has been known for many years and stated many times that the present set is inadequate and new sets have been developed by social scientists, but change comes slowly, if at all, in the federal bureaucracy and so the set of economic indicators continues largely as usual.

WHAT ARE SOCIAL INDICATORS?

Social indicators are always related to values and goals. They are measures that enable the user to (1) assess the social condition of some area or group with respect to some value or goal and (2) evaluate the impact of public programs designed to realize that value or achieve that goal. Almost all of the entries listed in this bibliography would endorse this definition. It embodies the major parts of all of the various definitions given, all of which were remarkable similar.

With respect to the three needs discussed in the preceeding section, this definition of social indicators very clearly satisfies them. The need for some ordering process for the social information being collected is satisfied by the use of social indicators themselves. With social indicators setting the context for data collection, much of the incompatability and non-coordination of present data series would be eliminated, because the standard methodology of social indicators would determine the type and form of all information to be collected. Consequently, it would be possible to obtain an accurate picture of society, which would greatly facilitate the establishment of priorities. The existence of problems, both emerging and persisting, would be more evident and their magnitude, the population segments affected, the geographical areas involved, and so on, would be known more exactly. This knowledge alone would enable priorities to be set according to statistically sound reasons, rather than the political reasons which now play such a prominent role. By establishing criteria for measuring the movement toward a specifically-stated goal by means of a program, social indicators enable administrators to evaluate the success or failure of the program in more important and revealing dimensions than the economic.

Social indicators are the units which make up the systems of indicators which are actually the tools described in this paper. A system of indicators is in effect a model of society into which relevant information is fed with the use of social indicators. This model must contain a statement of goals and desired attainment levels. It will reflect the values of the population segment involved. The information would be that which assesses present conditions and evaluates progress towards the goal. A summary listing of the many functions of such a social indicator system as described by the entries of this bibliography are:

1. Measure the extent of social ills and social well-being in a society.
2. Measure the gap between the current extent of social ills and the state of well-being declared to be the goal.
3. Provide structural information on the past and the present.
4. Assess where more and better information is required.
5. Measure the social costs and net returns on investments in social programs.
6. Measure the costs and benefits of each of the alternatives by which goals might be achieved.
7. Establish criteria of evaluation.
8. Formulate goals.
9. Make informed decisions about national priorities.
10. Improve understanding of what the future is likely to be.
11. Indicate control mechanisms.
12. Contribute to the analysis of social change.

THE PRIVACY QUESTION

There are many unsolved problems associated with the development of a statistically sound system of social indicators. In the near future, it seems certain that solutions to these problems will be found and that a social indicator system of some sort will be implemented, most probably by the federal government and on a national scale. But the implementation of such a system raises yet another problem, one far more serious in its consequences than any of those connected with the system's development. For this problem is the potential for large-scale invasion of privacy which is inherent in the use of indicator systems and data collection.

This potential for the invasion of privacy cannot be eliminated by restructuring the indicator system, for any system that possessed no potential for the invasion of privacy could not produce the information or perform the functions described in the previous sections. So the use of an indicator system must necessarily involve this potential for invading privacy.

Obviously, therefore, the benefits possible from the use of this system must outweigh the possible costs from the invasion of an individual's privacy. Not only must the users of the system believe this, but, more importantly, the people across the nation must believe it. This belief must rest upon the trust and confidence that the people have in the integrity and responsibility of the system's users, that is, in all probability, the federal government. And this is precisely the problem.

The American people, by and large, simply do not believe that the federal government is capable, honest and forthright. They do not have the degree of trust in the federal government which is essential if a social indicator system is to be implemented on the scale and in the

manner necessary to achieve its full potential. The reasons for this mistrust are too well known to anyone likely to be using this bibliography to be discussed here. Rather a short listing of the major reasons will suffice to show the depth and complexity of this mistrust and the great difficulty involved in dispelling it. The following seem to be the major causes of this national mistrust: the so-called credibility gap; the federal government's involvement in Southeast Asia; its inaction and, in some instances disregard for the dying environment; the complacency of the federal government in attempting to change the unjust conditions of America's minority populations and the corresponding hostility towards the government of these people; and the belief that wide-spread corruption exists throughout the federal and state levels of government.

The historical response to such widespread mistrust and dissatisfaction on the part of the American people has been to replace the present political leaders with ones believed to be more capable and honest. But where are such political leaders now? It is unfortunate, both for the nation generally and for a social indicator system specifically, that the very, very few persons capable of generating trust among the American poeple are highly unsuitable as political leaders to the sources of power in American politics. Needless to say, without the support of at least some of these power sources, a person, no matter how sterling his qualities and capabilities, will never be able to be elected.

So the situation with respect to a social indicator system comes down to this impasse. Its use is absolutely dependent upon the trust of the American people for its users, the government. But this trust does not exist to the necessary degree. Therefore, any indicator system will be largely ineffective, that is, will be unable to adequately

perform its many and sorely needed functions, until this trust is present. And realistically it does not appear that such trust will be forthcoming in the near future.

After reading most of the entries listed in this bibliography, I am convinced that a social indicator system of the type described, for example, by Bertram M. Gross, is vitally necessary if this nation is ever to achieve a quality of life for all its people. And yet, despite this conviction, if the present national administration (or any of the likely future administrations) were to inaugurate a social indicator system identical to the one proposed by Gross, I would in no way cooperate. I would give no information about myself. I would not condone, and would do all that I could to prevent, the release of any information about myself by an institution or person. This saddens me, for I believe that a social indicator system is very necessary and can be extremely useful in the pursuit and achievement of the quality of life, and it frightens me, for the present mistrust of the federal government's activities is simply another name for fear.

T. McVeigh

I. General

1. Dorfman, Robert (ed.). Measuring Benefits of Government Investments. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1965.

The lack of adequate criteria with which to measure the value of a project was the reason for holding the conference at the Brookings Institution on November 7-9, 1963, which resulted in this report. The stated purpose of the conference was "to assist in the development of new techniques for measuring the benefits and costs of public investments", but the conference discussions, primarily between academics and practitioners, actually focused on conceptual, and not methodological, issues. The main question addressed and therefore the major part of the report, was concerned with how far the traditional benefit-cost analysis could be extended to areas of government investment, other than water resources and defense.

2. Gross, Bertram M. "The City of Man: A Social Systems Accounting," in William R. Ewald, Jr., (ed.), Environment for Man: The Next Fifty Years. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967, pp. 136-156.

Gross explores five areas which have been developed from the new emerging ideas on urban planning: (1) American urban environments, especially megalopolis, as the society increasingly moves from an industrial to a post-industrial condition; (2) urban social systems accounting; (3) the need for a vision of the City of Man or Anthropolis; (4) the imperatives of power in the planning process; and (5) the self-identity of planners. All but the second are concerned with the social system itself or aspects of it. In these four areas, Gross describes the present situation and states the characteristics of Anthropolis, the principles, as it were, which he hopes will come to replace those now prevalent and contributing to the existing urban deterioration. The place and function of urban planners within this new social system is also discussed.

The second area, social systems accounting, focuses on the absolute necessity of providing for man in models of society, a point central to Gross' work on this subject. He proposes five aspects of social systems which must be present if this is to be achieved: (1) the position of individuals and groups as the central elements in the social system's structure; (2) the satisfactions or frustrations of these elements as the most important dimensions in the social system's performance; (3) the continuing process of conflict and cooperation between a social system and its environment and among its subsystems; (4) a complexity based both on interrelated subsystems and on the containment of systems within larger systems; and (5) the "looseness" of a system, that is, one composed of subsystems which are partly autonomous, imperfectly coordinated, partially controllable and never completely knowable.

3. _____. "Planning: Let's Not Leave It to the Economists," Challenge 14 (September-October, 1965), pp. 30-33.

Speaking against the pre-emption of what passes as national planning in this country by economists, Gross discusses the results of this, concluding that economic planning is more than merely economic. He also gives a very brief description of his use of modern systems theory to set forth a structure-performance model of society.

4. _____. "Urban Mapping for 1976 and 2000," Urban Affairs Quarterly 5 (December, 1969), pp. 121-142.

Gross discusses the interrelationships and interdependencies of three aspects of "urban mapping": citizen participation, data collection at the local level and sequential model building. He illustrates the need for a shift from the federal to all levels of government and presents his views on the emerging new forms of metropolitan leadership.

With respect to social reporting, however, in view of Gross" large contribution to research on this subject, the most useful section of this paper, one which should be read together with his more technical works, lists and describes seven examples of the kinds of concepts which Gross uses in his own work in developing a general system framework for urban model-building. These concepts essentially serve as guidelines helping to keep the author's work in a realistic perspective.

5. Helmer, Olaf with Bernice Brown and Theodore Gordon. Social Technology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

This book's major concern is a "reappraisal of methodology in the social sciences. It will not only attempt to establish the need for such a reappraisal, but will offer specific proposals for methodological modification of traditional procedures." The primary changes recommended are the use of mathematical and simulation models and the expanded use of experts. But the most informative and innovative section of the book is entitled, "The Society of the Future," for here the author explores three problems associated with research on the future, all directly related to social indicators: (1) prediction (2) with individual preference, and (3) with a democratic choice mechanism for expressing social preference.

6. Holleb, Doris B. Social and Economic Information for Urban Planning. Volume I - Its Selection and Use. Volume II - A Directory of Data Sources. Chicago: The Center for Urban Studies, The University of Chicago, 1969.

As the body of statistical information relevant to urban problems increases, the need for directories and inventories of sources is obvious. This is an attempt to supply these needs by citing the data

requirements of urban planning and the sources of available data in the areas of population, housing, transportation, economic performance, education, social welfare, health, public safety, environmental quality and leisure time activity, all of which are presented with the intention of increasing the sensitivity and awareness of the planner to the interrelationships among social, economic and physical factors involved in urban planning.

7. Moynihan, Daniel P. "Urban Environment: General," in Bertram M. Gross (ed.), Social Intelligence for America's Future. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969, pp. 495-519.

As the title suggests, this article contains the thoughts of the author on a variety of subjects related to the urban environment. A good portion of these thoughts are devoted to social indicators, in which Moynihan agrees with Gross that "the object of social indicators should be to report the condition of man in the metropolitan area in three categories: (1) individuals; (2) families; and (3) institutions." The author offers four guidelines which he believes are essential to the development of an adequate and usable indicator system. Indicators must be (1) in the realm of disaggregation and correlation, (2) pan-political, (3) both present- and future-oriented, and (4) able to provide comparisons between local data, average national data and data corresponding to "best practice" in various fields.

8. National Research Council, Advisory Committee on Governmental Programs in the Behavioral Sciences. The Behavioral Sciences and the Federal Government. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences Publication 1680, 1968.

The potential contributions of the social and behavioral sciences to governmental policies and programs and the relationships which must exist if both the sciences and the government are to extract full benefit from these contributions are the major subjects of this report. It calls for a pluralistic approach to government support of these sciences and a greater concern for the advantages and necessity of such support on the part of the government.

9. National Science Board, Special Commission on the Social Sciences. Knowledge into Action: Improving the Nation's Use of the Social Sciences. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

In response to the charge of "making recommendations for increasing the useful application of the social sciences in the solution of contemporary social problems," this Special Commission focuses on the relation of the social sciences to the various sectors composing this society. One section, entitled "Providing Better Social Science Data," is particularly relevant to the purpose of this bibliography. This section recommends three steps in order to provide more adequate information

about the state of the nation: (1) an increase in both public and private funding for intensified research to develop better social indicators; (2) increased linkages, to be provided by the federal government, between bodies of data already being collected; and (3) increased provisions for the protection of privacy.

10. U.S. President, Commission on National Goals. Goals for Americans: Programs for Action in the Sixties. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Maintaining that a rededication to the principle that every human being shall be free to develop his capacities to the fullest extent, this Commission report identifies goals, both national and international, and proposes various related programs. While this report's substance is hardly controversial or comprehensive, nevertheless it is worthy of attention. if only for the fact that an attempt was made on a national level to establish a series of goals for this country. It is unfortunate that these attempts are relegated to a state of inaction, more often than not, by political powers.

11. U.S. President, Science Advisory Committee, Life Sciences Panel, Behavioral Sciences Subpanel. Strengthening the Behavioral Sciences. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Noting the progress in the development of methods for data collecting and processing, this Committee calls for the systematic collection of basic behavioral data concerning the structure and functioning of United States society. Furthermore, the federal government is urged to take the lead in this endeavor.

A. Legislation

12. Horowitz, Irving L. and Lee Rainwater. "Comment: Social Accounting for the Nation," Trans-action (May, 1967).

These two social scientists discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the passage of Senator Mondale's bill (see No. 13) to create a Council of Social Advisors, to provide for an Annual Social Report and to establish a Joint Committee on the Social Report in the Congress. Both are very much in favor of passage, citing the benefits and changes it will bring to both government agencies and the social sciences.

13. Mondale, Walter F. "New Tools for Social Progress," The Progressive 31 (September, 1967), pp. 28-31.

In this article, the sponsor of the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act (see No. 14) explains the reasons for his sponsorhip of this legislation and its purposes. His concern for the "social health of the nation", together with the realization that improvement was hindered by the inadequacy of existing social measures and information, was the major force behind this legislation. The sections of the Act, if passed and implemented, would, according to the author, improve the quantitative knowledge of social needs, enable the measurement of progress or lack of it at all levels of government toward realizing social objectives and assist in a more knowledgeable ordering of priorities. This article goes beyond the legislation itself to its sponsor, enabling the reader to better understand the causes and hopes which led to his sponsorship of this Act.

14. U.S. Congress, Senate. Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Research, Ninetieth Congress, First Session. Hearings on the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act. (S. 843) Parts I, II, III. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

These hearings, held during 1967, were on legislation, introduced by Senator Mondale, which would create a Council of Social Advisors within the Office of the President, provide for an annual social report, establish a joint committee on the social report in the Congress, and encourage the development of a system of social indicators to measure the quality of American life.

15. U.S. Congress, Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Special Subcommittee on Evaluation and Planning of Social Programs. Ninety-first Congress, First and Second Sessions. Hearings on the Full Opportunity Act (S. 5) to Promote the Public Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

These hearings were held in July and December of 1969 and in March of 1970. The bill discussed establishing full social opportunity for every American as a national goal, placing primary responsibility for its achievement with the Federal Government. Similar to the bill previously discussed, it would establish a Council of Social Advisors to the President, an Office of Goals and Priorities Analysis in the Congress and calls for an Annual Social Report from the President to the Congress.

II. Information Surveys

A. General

16. Almendinger, Vladimir V., Emory W. Franks and Joel M. Kibbee. Urban and Regional Information Systems: On the Threshold of a Technology. Santa Monica, California: Systems Development Corporation, 1966.

Present day urban and regional planning techniques increasingly rely on the systematic analysis of vast amounts of data. An information system is a system which employs an electronic computing facility to develop information from a relevant set of data. A great number and variety of factors must be considered in the design and implementation of urban and regional information systems. This document reviews some of these factors, and serves as a prospectus for a study of urban and regional information systems as they relate to comprehensive planning and programming.

17. American Society of Planning Officials. Threshold of Planning Information Systems. Selected papers presented at the ADP workshops conducted at the ASPO National Planning Conference, Houston, April, 1967.

Presented is a series of papers on the following specific topics: the present state of information systems and requirements for future development; the exploration of various aspects of municipal information systems research; the geographic implications of urban information systems; and the data processing requirements and needs of urban planning.

18. Bauer, Raymond A. "Social Indicators and Sample Surveys," Public Opinion Quarterly 30 (Fall, 1966), pp. 339-352.

"In this, his Presidential address to the American Association for Public Opinion Research on May 7, 1966, Professor Bauer makes a strong plea for greater use of sample surveys to collect a greater variety of basic social statistics. He believes that this will enable us to plot trends, the better to measure progress toward the attainment of social goals and values. He points up emphatically the pioneering role that unofficial research can and should play, especially in the area of controversial innovation." (Abstract in Public Opinion Quarterly).

19. The Council of State Governments. Proceedings, Conference on Information Systems Coordination. Washington, D.C.: The Council of State Governments, Committee on Information Systems, January 29-30, 1968.

The participants of this Conference were members of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of state government in addition to various professionals concerned with information systems. The papers presented here cover a wide range of subjects pertinent to the subject, all revolving around the central focus of the Conference which was policy at the state level of government concerning information systems.

20. Gross, Bertram M. "Let's Have a Real State of the Union Message," Challenge 14 (May-June, 1966), pp. 8-10.

Making a case against the present content of the President's State of the Union Message for not identifying major trends in American society, reporting on the quality of life, both past and present, or stating goals in terms concrete enough to serve as guides to action and criteria of progress, Gross once again calls for an Annual Social Report from the President to deal with those areas presently neglected. He states that the initiation of Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) in every governmental agency has illustrated the need for the development of social indicators and places the task of ordering this social data on the Annual Social Report. Finally, he describes and illustrates the faults in the present information system which misses, does not use and misinterprets much necessary data. These faults would be largely corrected by adequate social and economic indicators, which always serve as both "indicators and indictors."

21. Holleb, Doris B. "Social Statistics for Social Policy," in American Society of Planning Officials, Planning 1968. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1968, pp. 80-85.

Stating that the present state of social information is poor, the author sees two main tasks: (1) the reorganization of existing social data into usable and more illuminating form; and (2) the development of a set of social indicators. A discussion of social indicators, their characteristics and problems in their development, follows.

22. Russett, Bruce M., et al. World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

The authors have attempted to compare many nations as to their relative implementation of the fundamental human rights proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Using these rights as norms to guide aspirations, data is presentedcovering the areas of human resources, government and politics, communications, wealth, health,

education, family and social relations, distribution of wealth and income, and religion. Perhaps the most useful parts of this book in terms of social indicators are those which try to discover and analyze trends and patterns existing in the data and which discuss the specific problems associated with obtaining accurate information in such areas.

23. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Urban and Regional Information Systems: Support for Planning in Metropolitan Areas. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

This report provides immediate and long-range guidelines for planning agencies involved in planning the development and implementation of the computer-based Urban and Regional Information Systems (URIS).

The report analyzes the issues and problems raised in the development of a URIS. Contents of the report are aimed at providing planning professionals, as well as information system specialists, with a common basis for planning a URIS.

The report presents a detailed exposition of problems and discussion of requirements for incorporating the following data base requirements and management capabilities in development plans for an urban and regional information system: (1) procedures for data base documentatin; (2) measures that assure data compatability; (3) policies and procedures for data release; and (4) plans for continuing data acquisition.

The report also describes four operational features of URIS data processing systems that benefit the planner. It is recommended that the data processing system components of a URIS: (1) possess a comprehensive set of processing capabilities for urban and regional planning; (2) provide the mechanisms for planners to communicate easily with the system and data base through a convenient nonprogrammer language that is oriented to users' processing needs; (3) respond to changes in users' processing needs; and (4) facilitate incorporation of additional processing capabilities.

An extensive bibliography and an index to the material are provided in parts two and three of this report.

24. U.S. President's Research Committee on Social Trends. Recent Social Trends in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1934.

In twenty-nine chapters, each devoted to a particular aspect of American society, this massive report documents major patterns and characteristics of life in the United States. This is an extraordinary endeavor, one which, unfortunately, has not been attempted to such an extent since 1934.

25. Urban and Regional Information Systems Association.

This organization is "dedicated to the advancement of an interdisciplinary and multiprofessional approach to the planning, designing, and operating of urban information systems." Annually, from 1963, the Association has published papers presented at its conference; these papers do not discuss social indicators directly, but their emphasis on information systems makes an important contribution to their development. It should be noted that no papers were published from the 1963 Conference and that, for the conferences from 1964 through 1966, the papers were published under the title, Selected Papers of the _____ Annual Conference on Urban Planning Information Systems and Programs.

26. Webber, Melvin M. "The Roles of Intelligence Systems in Urban-Systems Planning," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 31 (November, 1965), pp. 289-296.

"In response to the growing demand for good information that might support rational development decisions, 'intelligence centers' are proposed, operating with an interim programming strategy. These centers would serve the multiplicity of groups in the urban areas, supplying improved inventories and forecasts; and they would serve governmental investors by designing targets, programs and strategies for public action. They would inevitably be engaged in politics and action, but they would bring the scientific morality into urban affairs.... They are proposed as the effective city planning agencies for this era of flux." (Excerpted from JAIP Abstract)

B. Health, Education and Welfare

27. Coleman, James, et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.

This survey was requested by Congress to provide a comprehensive data collection on a national scale in the field of educational opportunity. Focusing on six racial and ethnic groups in the United States, the survey attempts to provide information on the following questions: (1) the extent of racial and ethnic segregation in the public schools; (2) the extent of equal educational opportunity offered by the schools by using several indicators; (3) the degree of learning by the students as measured by performance on standardized achievement tests; and (4) any possible relationships between students' achievements and the types of schools they attend.

28. Gurr, Ted. "A Causal Model of Civil Strife: A Comparative Analysis Using New Indices," The American Political Science Review 62 (December, 1968), pp. 1104-1124.

This paper describes in part the product of research undertaken "to assess and refine a causal model of the general condition of several forms of civil strife, using cross-sectional analyses of data collected for 114 polities." The author's argument consists of stipulating a set of variables said to determine the likelihood and magnitude of civil strife. Briefly, the model states that relative deprivation is the fundamental precondition for civil strife and that this relation is mediated by four societal variables: coercive potential, institutionalization, facilitation and the legitimacy of the political regime in which strife occurs.

29. Heer, David M. (ed.). Social Statistics and the City. Cambridge: Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, 1968.

This report of a conference held in Washington, D.C. on June 22-23, 1967, is not particularly innovative or even comprehensive in its emphasis. But, because it is concerned with the present inadequacies of the U.S. Census in the quality and quantity of data, especially of the urban poor, its inclusion in this bibliography is felt to be necessary, for no other reason than the fact that the initial step in the development of a set of social indicators is the improvement of present information systems, among which the Census is predominant. Somewhat cautious recommendations were endorsed by the participants of the Conference on the following topics: improving coverage of Blacks, Puerto Ricans and Mexicans in the Census, improving the vital statistics for these groups, and needed additions in available social statistics for these three groups.

30. Miller, S.M., Martin Rein, Pamela Roby and Bertram M. Gross. "Poverty, Inequality, and Conflict," in Bertram M. Gross (ed.), Social Intelligence for America's Future. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969, pp. 283-329.

Unlike most of the entries in this bibliography, this paper views its subject from the perspectives of non-government organizations and their needs. Its major premise is that a new definition of poverty, namely "relative deprivation," is necessary. Within this definition, six dimensions measuring the quality of life are proposed: income, assets, basic services, social mobility and education, political position, and status and satisfaction. Indicators are proposed which will assist in illuminating existing inequalities. In addition, the development of indicators is recognized as originating from two necessary perspectives: the first is from an observed problem to the necessary indicators and the second, in an attempt to assess current policies, moves from programs to indicators.

31. Morgan, James N. and James D. Smith. "Measures of Economic Well-Offness and their Correlates," The American Economic Review 59 (May, 1969), pp. 450-462.

This article is a good example of how economic research, when carried out with a recognition of its sociological implications, can assist and perhaps accelerate the development of social indicators to the level of present economic indicators. A theoretical model of the interrelationships between various kinds of economic behavior, economic status and attitudes was tested and supplemented by surveys on the background of the family heads, arriving at an index of well-offness. This research was in this way brought directly to bear upon various aspects of poverty and its causes.

32. Runciman, W.G. Relative Deprivation and Social Justice. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

After a brief outline of historical changes and trends in British society, the author attempts to answer two questions. The first is, "What is the relation between institutionalized inequalities and the awareness or resentment of them?" And the second, "Which, if any, of these inequalities ought to be perceived and resented----whether they are or not----by the standards of social justice?" Evidence presented with respect to the first is taken primarily from a national sample survey carried out by the author in 1962. The second obviously does not lend itself to such techniques, but the author discusses one possible answer, using a modified version of the contractual theory of justice. In addition, he discusses the differences in social justice with respect to the different dimensions of social inequality, namely class, status and power.

Because poverty is generally considered by researchers in this field as relative deprivation rather than as a static condition, this

book by attempting and largely succeeding to assess the degree of relative deprivation in a national society is a very useful study. One hopes that a similar endeavor will be undertaken soon in this country.

33. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Program Analysis. Health, Education and Welfare Indicators. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957-February, 1967, monthly.

Published monthly, this publication features articles on major problems and issues in the areas of health, education and welfare. It also presents current data in these areas.

34. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Program Analysis. Health, Education and Welfare Trends. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959-1967, annually.

In two parts, Trends reports the annual statistical information concerning "program operations and current social, demographic and economic developments affecting future directions in health, education and welfare." Part I presents national data for several past decades in various subject areas, thus providing a long-term perspective. Part II, entitled "State Data and State Rankings in Health, Education and Welfare," and issued separately, shows the relative degrees of response among the states to problems of health, education and welfare.

35. _____. Office of Program Analysis. New Directions in Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

This publication is a series of papers dealing with various aspects of health, education and welfare, all of which have previously been featured in the monthly Indicators of HEW. From the introduction, this publication is an "outgrowth of analysis undertaken during the past two years of program developments and needs in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare by the Office of Program Analysis."

C. Mental Health

36. Bradburn, Norman M. and David Caplovitz. Reports on Happiness. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

The sub-title of this book is "A Pilot Study of Behavior Related to Mental Health." The authors are engaged in a program of research geared to measuring periodically the socio-psychological state of the American public in the hopes of determining trends for the nation as a whole and for various subgroups with respect to many different indicators of mental health. As a part of this long-term research, this book reports the authors' findings of their study of four Illinois communities concerning the happiness or the mental well-being of the inhabitants. The purpose (and substance) of these efforts is described by the authors: "With more detailed knowledge of how people live their lives, what problems they encounter in their everyday activities and how they cope with these problems, how they view their relations with other people, and how they spend their time, we should be in a better position to determine the nature of mental health, as well as to study the causes of mental illness."

37. Cantril, Hadley. The Patterns of Human Concerns. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

While there is little enough research being done on social indicators and reporting, there is even less statistical work being done on the development of measures of the feelings of people within the context of social reporting. This book provides concrete information about the hopes and fears of persons in various stages of development within their own culture and in a variety of countries in varying phases of development. The approach is psychological, rather than sociological. From his survey data, the author constructs a possible pattern of human concerns, presenting the sequential phases of concerns as external and internal circumstances with respect to persons change.

38. Richard, Robert. Subjective Social Indicators. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, September, 1969.

This is in no way a scholarly or research report; rather it is intended for use as a guide to policy-makers and social-action agencies involved in program planning and evaluation research. It reports on a methodological study undertaken to define and measure a set of variables which collectively should yield a "social profile of target areas." The "subjective" in the title refers to those measures of attitudes, preferences, aspirations and so forth, and, as such, presents information about an area of social reporting often ignored.

D. Natural Resources

39. Landsberg, Hans H., Leonard L. Fischman and Joseph L. Fisher. Resources in America's Future: Patterns of Requirements and Availabilities, 1960-2000. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

Using projections of the supply and demand of natural resources available to the United States, the authors put forth the following question: "Given that both population and expectations will increase during the last four decades of the century, can the United States rely on sufficient natural resources to sustain a rate of economic growth sufficient to achieve these increased expectations?" In answering, the authors have divided the book into three parts: Requirements for Future Living; Demand for Key Materials; and Adequacy of the Resource Base. Generally, their findings are encouraging, provided that certain broad lines of action which they propose are carried out.

E. Housing and Urban Development

40. Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research. Design for the Use of Survey Research in the Evaluation of the Impact of the Model-Cities Program on the Residents of Model-City Neighborhoods. New York: Report submitted to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, December, 1968.

The model described in this report is designed to answer the question "How does the program effect the whole system of variables in which those which are intended to be affected are embedded?" In short, both direct and indirect consequences are the subject of this evaluation model. This report begins with an analysis of poverty from several perspectives, then develops and applies various sets of categories from basic social theory to guide the construction of measures of the quality of life. These include: "the economic, status and power dimensions of life; the behavioral, attitudinal and cognitive aspects of individual responses; the objective and subjective evaluation of changes; and the individual, interpersonal, institutional and community responses." In the remainder of the report, these concepts are operationalized with the major emphasis being on the measurement of both social contexts and individual responses with respect to the Model-Cities Program.

41. Jacoby, Joan E. "DEWS---District Early Warning System for Neighborhood Deterioration," in Urban and Regional Information Systems for Social Programs, Papers from the Fifth Annual Conference of the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association, Garden City, New York: September 7-9, 1967.

DEWS is a tool for physical and social city planning to evaluate and support programs for community renewal in relocation and housing programs. Its purpose is to record the amount and intensity of change on a block face level to show impact of programs on neighborhood conditions. It will attempt to integrate social, economic and property information by using records of local housing code violations, welfare recipients, crime and health violations which will be correlated to indicate changing status of blocks as they improve or deteriorate. It will maximize the effectiveness of local government planning boards by giving them concrete data with which to sell their program and to aid in preventing further chaos in renewal programs. This system will be tested in an area of Washington, D.C.

A flow diagram of the DEWS operation and an Appendix of Information contained in DEWS are included. (Conference Abstract)

III. Social Indicators

A. Specific Problems and Aspects

42. Bauer, Raymond A. "Social Indicators: Or Working in a Society which Has Better Social Statistics," in Stanford Anderson (ed.), Planning for Diversity and Choice. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1968, pp. 237-258.

This paper was presented at a conference held at MIT in October of 1966 which had the intention of providing information and opinions on the improvement of architectural education in the United States. As such, Bauer addresses himself mainly to the architectural profession and its data requirements. However, the paper provides a good summary of the thinking of one of the foremost researchers on social indicators on the present deficiencies of available social statistics, forces in the society working both for and against the development of a system of indicators and the characteristics, uses and techniques most likely to be involved in the social data system which will eventually emerge.

He discusses the fairly recent increases in interest and research on social indicator systems and briefly presents his opinions concerning the likely outcome of such endeavors.

43. Gross, Bertram M. and Michael Springer (eds.), "Political Intelligence for America's Future," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 388 (March, 1970). Entire issue.

The three parts of this issue are: "On Societal Guidance;" "The Uses of Social Knowledge;" and "On Social Accounts." Within each part are presented several papers by some of the most notable researchers in the field of social indicators and accounting. The first part focuses on the guidance function of social accounting, in terms of managing society, the system of legislative intelligence and the knowledge and mobilization of a societal unit. The second part explores the uses of social information for political institutions, industry and urban institutions and experts. The third speaks about indicators of culture, utilizing the examples of television violence, of foreign involvements on the part of the United States, values with respect to poverty and race relations in America and finally discusses an analytic framework for social reporting and policy analysis.

One chapter, in particular, entitled "Social Indicators, Reports and Accounts: Toward the Management of Society," is especially recommended for its overview and analysis of the major trends in research on social reporting.

44. Gross, Bertram M. (ed.). Social Intelligence for America's Future. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

This volume first appeared as the May and September issues of The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for 1967.

Of the five parts into which this volume is divided, the first, entitled "Some Basic Issues," is most pertinent to the topic of this bibliography. The severity of the domestic "intelligence gap" is underscored and its consequences, particularly with respect to rational, adequate policy-making, is explored. Part One mainly analyzes the reasons for this gap, ranging from technical problems in the development and use of indicators themselves to ignorance on the part of policy-makers as to their purpose. A rather lengthy and comprehensive table, "Indicator Suggestions," is very useful and enlightening as to the range and variety of data necessary for adequate social reporting in the future.

Parts Two, Three, Four and Five discuss in varying detail the most obvious defects in existing social information on several areas of social concern. While these sections in general are not directly relevant to this bibliography, the reader is referred to three chapters which are: "Science, Technology and Change" by John McHale (see No. 39); "Poverty, Inequality and Conflict" by S.M. Miller et al. (see No. 23); and "Urban Environment: General" by Daniel P. Moynihan (see No. 7).

45. Katzman, Martin T. "Social Indicators and Urban Public Policy," American Society of Planning Officials, Planning 1968. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1968, pp. 85-94.

Social indicators are defined as "measurements of social phenomena whose movements indicate (1) whether a particular social phenomenon is increasing or decreasing; and (2) whether a particular problem is getting better or worse relative to some goal," with the properties of scalability, reliability and validity. The interrelation of these properties is developed.

46. Lawson, Simpson. "Academe: People Who Live in Cities Are Being Scrutinized, Analyzed, and Dissected by the Behavioral Scientists," City 3 (October, 1969), pp. 8-10.

The author summarizes very briefly some of the high points of several papers and discussions given at the conventions of the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, and the American Political Science Association, all held during the same week in September of 1969 in Washington, D.C. Because of its brevity, this article offers no in-depth analysis, but does raise questions about the problems associated with defining poverty as relative deprivation and a few of the problems that these professionals see in social indicators.

47. Michigan Office of Planning Coordination, Bureau of Policies and Programs. Social Reporting in Michigan: Problems and Issues. Lansing, Michigan: Prepared by Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies, January, 1970.

This report outlines the preliminary endeavors in the development of a regular system of social reporting for the State of Michigan and a region within the state. It reviews the existing state of social reporting in the state at the federal, state and local levels and discusses various technical and conceptual problems in the development and use of societal data.

Of primary interest, however, is this report's attempt to develop a social indicator system at the state level, an area usually neglected by researchers in the field with their emphasis on national social reporting. A selective number of areas were chosen for study with respect to the availability, reliability, comparability and so forth, of data at both the state and local levels. The first step necessary is the development of a set of social indicators, while the second, which is actually inherent in the first, is the resolution of the nature of the causal relationships between any indicator and the situations it was developed to measure. This is considered to be the biggest problem.

Finally, a three part proposal providing for regular and reliable public information on the quality of life in Michigan is presented, calling for annual Social Goals and Indicator Reports, supplemented by more detailed annual reports in several areas of major concern and the development of a supportive program to improve the quality of social data in these and other areas. As to the last part, several recommendations which, if put into effect at once, would begin this improvement, are presented.

48. Sheldon, Eleanor B. and Howard E. Freeman. "Notes on Social Indicators: Promises and Potential." Paper presented at the Statistical Users Conference, November, 1969.

The authors present a detailed analysis of social indicators with respect to what they can and cannot do. According to this paper, indicators can contribute to "improved descriptive reporting; to the analysis of social change; and to the prediction of future social events and social life," but cannot set goals and priorities, evaluate programs or develop a balance sheet. Their reasoning should be considered carefully since their view of the limitations of social indicators are not shared by most of the researchers in this field.

B. Partial Systems

49. Cohen, Wilbur J. "Social Indicators: Statistics for Public Policy," The American Statistician 22 (October, 1968), pp. 14-16.

Focusing on the needs of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Cohen describes two types of information needed: first, measures which describe present conditions (social indicators) and, second, measures which suggest the cost and effectiveness of various methods of problem resolution. Social accounts and their functions are also discussed, as is the need for decision-makers and administrators able to effectively use these kinds of statistics.

50. Gross, Bertram M. "The New Systems Budgeting," Public Administration Review 29 (March-April, 1969), pp. 113-137.

After describing and explaining the present system of planning-programming-budgeting and giving a history of its development, Gross discusses the potentials involved in the continued use of PPBS. Most important for our purpose is the use of basic systems concepts presently overlooked: "the social and physical environment of a system (and system-environment relations), the structure of systems and subsystems (and the role of planned or unplanned structural change), and aspects of system performance (or functioning) other than the bare transformation of inputs into outputs."

In short, this article analyzes PPBS as presently used and as it can be used in the future in terms of the system structure-system performance model which Gross developed in The State of the Nation (see No. 61).

51. McHale, John. "Science, Technology and Change," in Bertram M. Gross (ed.), Social Intelligence for America's Future. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969, pp. 220-245.

Focusing on scientific and technological change, McHale discusses what social indicators measuring such change must involve. He discusses the necessity of transferring present quantitative indicators into qualitative form, the importance of surrogate indicators in assisting in this transference, the provision of and access to services based, not on income levels, but perhaps on professional and occupational roles and the importance generally of increasing the availability and choice of services. The problems involved in the design of such indicators are also analyzed.

52. New York State Office of Planning Coordination. The Design of a Central Social Environment Study. Albany: Prepared by CONSAD Research Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, June, 1970.

A general description of a tentative social systems model, accompanied by an analysis of the problems inherent in its development, is put forth in this report. The predominant emphasis is not on the actual model and its functioning, but rather on the research and analytical procedures considered essential to its development. As part of the working-stage character of this report, partial system models and social indicators are discussed primarily in terms of how to better utilize available information. The purpose of partial system models and their advantages particularly at the present time are discussed, together with a specification of social indicators to describe the social condition of New York. Finally, having decided what should be done in New York with respect to general and partial system models and a social indicator system, the report concludes with a proposed work program to achieve these goals.

53. Ruff, Jean-Paul A. "Detroit Social Management System," in Urban and Regional Information Systems for Social Programs, Papers from the Fifth Annual Conference of the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association, Garden City, New York: September 7-9, 1967.

The author establishes criteria for developing a mathematical model for a social management system allocating resources to needs according to a set of maximizing programs. (Conference Abstract)

54. Wilensky, Harold L. Organizational Knowledge: Knowledge and Policy in Government and Industry. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

The ways in which knowledge shapes policy, which the author calls the "classic problem in social science," are explored in this book. Understanding of these ways has become indispensable for the proper operation of administrative life and the effective pursuit of the public interest by the merger of the knowledge explosion and the organizational revolution, according to the author. The primary aim of this book is to call attention to the great importance of the intelligence function in complex social systems by bringing some order to the scattered literature on organizational intelligence and by developing hypotheses about the determinants and uses of intelligence and the structural and doctrinal roots of intelligence failures. From these analyses, those conditions which facilitate the flow of high quality intelligence are discerned and discussed.

Because social indicators are matters and measures of public policy, the author's focus on the characteristics, needs and functions of administrators, both in government and industry, illustrates very graphically the need for some indicator system and points out the inherent problems in its development and use.

55. Wilson, John O. "Quality of Life in the United States---An Excursion into the New Frontier of Socio-Economic Indicators." Kansas City: Midwest Research Institute, 1969.

This paper presents a detailed ranking of the fifty states with respect to several socio-economic indicators developed by the author using currently collected information from national, state, local and other sources. The nine areas for which indicators were developed are: individual status, racial equality, state and local government, education, economic growth quality, technological change, agriculture, living conditions, and health and welfare.

IV. Social Indicators

A. General Systems

56. Alamo Area Council of Governments. Social Indicators and a Social Accounting System for the AACOG Region: A Preliminary Statement. San Antonio, Texas: Alamo Area Council of Governments, 1969.

The task is to develop measures of the effect of public policy and its implementation upon the various social problems being confronted. This preliminary statement outlines the functions of a social accounting system, including a definition and discussion of the functions of social indicators. More important than these, however, to the public official and planner is the attempt to outline the steps involved in the development of a social accounting system for the AACOG region. Each of the steps, as might be expected, raises more problems, which hopefully will be addressed in later statements. Concluding this report is a listing of social indicators for each of the functional areas, eg. health, housing, welfare, economic opportunity, of social concern.

57. Bell, Daniel. "The Adequacy of Our Concepts," in Bertram M. Gross (ed.), A Great Society? New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968, pp. 127-161.

The effects of the vast increase in population and the type and rate of diffusion of products and privileges among the population come down, in Bell's view, to one major problem: the question of the size and scope of the social unit. Put another way he is trying to address the problem of creating a human scale in this mass society. He presents an historical perspective leading to this problem and analyzes four different dimensions of the problem, which leads him to recognizing the need for a system of social accounts which "would move us toward measurement of the utilization of human resources on our society in four areas: (1) the measurement of social costs and net returns of innovations; (2) the measurement of social ills; (3) the creation of performance budgets in areas of defined social needs; and (4) indicators of economic opportunity and social mobility. His elaborations on these four areas suggest the complexity of problems and the scope of application.

58. _____. "The Idea of a Social Report," The Public Interest, Number 15 (Spring, 1969), pp. 72-84.

This paper serves as a short summary of the history and background leading up to Toward a Social Report (see No. 68). Bell discusses the work on social costs and social trends which provide a foundation for current work on social indicators and emphasizes the lag from then to now. Toward a Social Report itself is discussed in terms of its purposes and necessarily limited scope due to its preliminary status. The author

also gives his opinion concerning some next steps which should be taken at the federal level of government in order to proceed from Toward a Social Report.

59. Bauer, Raymond A. (ed.). Social Indicators. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1966.

This book is required reading for anyone beginning to study social indicators. Its focus is nothing less than the entire set of social indicators used in American society. Defining social indicators as measures "that enable us to assess where we stand and are going with respect to our values and goals, and to evaluate specific programs and determine their impact," the authors stress that anticipation, not prediction of the future, is their concern. They, therefore, are concerned with the probability of events occurring in the future and their importance in the event that they do occur, and moreover, recognize the restrictions on future thinking which develop when these two are confused.

The remaining four chapters are devoted to an examination of the present state of social indicators from a sociological point of view (Albert D. Biderman); a presentation of an ideal system of social statistics (Bertram M. Gross---see his The State of the Nation, No. 61, for an expanded analysis); a discussion of the need for research and collection facilities for events falling outside regular statistical series (Albert D. Biderman); and an analysis of the problems involved in the organization of this new data, particularly in terms of a feedback mechanism (Robert A. Rosenthal and Robert S. Weiss). Looking to the future, this volume, more successfully than most others, has attempted to devise the ideal societal information system, detail its uses, and analyze its advantages and disadvantages.

60. Gross, Bertram M. "The Social State of the Union," Trans-action 3 (November-December, 1965), pp. 14-17.

A shorter account of Gross' views on social indicator systems that is expanded in both Bauer's Social Indicators and Gross' The State of the Nation (see Nos. 59 and 61 respectively), in which the author calls for an annual Social Report from the President to supplement and expand the Economic Report and Budget Message, thus giving a more accurate and comprehensive assessment of the quality of life in America.

This article should be read before reading Gross' other contributions to this field, particularly with respect to his analysis of social structure and social performance.

61. Gross, Bertram M. The State of the Nation. London: Tavistock Publications, 1966.

A general model for social system accounting on the level of nation-states is presented which analyzes the society in terms of two, interrelated, multidiemnsional concepts: system structure and system performance. Gross explores the characteristics, basic units and interrelations of these two concepts, with each other and with the external environment. Briefly, system structure consists of human and non-human resources arranged in interrelated subsystems, governed by certain values and central guidance system, while system performance consists of actions that acquire resources, produce and invest within the system.

In his last chapter, "Toward Social Indicators," Gross concentrates mainly on two conceptual difficulties encountered in the development of indicators. The first is called the Selectivity-Comprehensiveness Paradox and the second, the Abstraction-Specificity Paradox. Each is described, explained in terms of the problems they present to developers and users of indicators and also their functions. Gross closes by urging that nations prepare annual social reports, that state of the world surveys be undertaken and that a long-range perspective be acquired by all involved in these activities.

62. Kamrany, Nake M. and Alexander N. Christakis. Social Indicators in Perspective. Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, July, 1969.

After a summary presentation of the need for indicators to measure well-being and a brief discussion of the trend from economic to social indicators, this paper presents a conception of social indicators embodying the following characteristics: completeness, geographical delineation, an effective level of disaggregation, and relevance to some cohesive national process of policy planning. Social indicators, in themselves, are meaningless and so the authors have constructed a conceptual model which can be used to identify the major dimensions of the process involved in national policy planning. The role of social indicators within this model is explored in depth.

63. Moore, Wilbert E. and Eleanor B. Sheldon. "Monitoring Social Change: A conceptual and Programmatic Statement," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section. Washington, D.C.: American Statistical Association, 1965, pp. 144-149.

This is a summary outline of work in progress which eventually resulted in the publication of Indicators of Social Change: Concepts and Measurements (see No. 66). The authors briefly discuss their aims, the organization of their work and their progress in research.

64. Olson, Mancur, Jr. "The Plan and Purpose of a Social Report," The Public Interest, Number 15 (Spring, 1969), pp. 85-97.

The author had immediate responsibility for Toward a Social Report and attempts in this paper to answer those basic questions which he says were unanswered by that report. He sets out to explain the conception of social reporting that determined both the shape and contents of the report, noting that a policy focus and a framework of optimization is evident in every chapter of the report and that the resulting purpose of these was to point out the practical importance relevant research can have in these areas.

65. _____. "Social Indicators and Social Accounts," in Socio-Economic Planning Sciences 2 (1969), pp. 335-346.

Two defining characteristics of social indicators are discussed in this paper. The first is that social indicators, unlike most indicators now used by the government, are measures of direct normative interest, and the second is that social indicators "should fit into a balanced systematic scheme of classification or aggregation which would make possible a balanced assessment of socio-economic progress or retrogression in some broad area, as well as disaggregated and detailed study of particular problems.

Social accounts, which, according to the author, consist of social indicators and additional statistics, would expand cost-benefit analysis and rational public decision-making by relating social expenditures to the indicator they were designed to affect.

66. Sheldon, Eleanor B. and Wilbert E. Moore (eds.). Indicators of Social Change: Concepts and Measurements. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.

Defining social change as "the significant alteration of social structures (that is, patterns of action and interaction), including consequences and manifestations of such structures embodied in norms (rules of conduct), values, and cultural products or symbols," the view expressed in this volume is limited to the central features of a society's operation, but it is a fruitful limitation for the authors attempt an in-depth analysis and answer to the question: "What is changing?" To this end, they have organized their work around five major headings: (1) demographic base and shifts; (2) major structural components of society; (3) distributive features of American society; (4) aggregative features of American society; and (5) the meaning of welfare. This is a very analytic, rather than practical, work which illustrates very well the importance and complexity of change in this society.

67. Sheldon, Eleanor B. and Wilbert E. Moore. "Toward the Measurement of Social Change: Implications for Progress," in Leonard H. Goodman (ed.), Economic Progress and Social Welfare. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966, pp. 185-212.

Most of the work of this research team concerning social indicators is geared to presenting a framework for the examination of large-scale structural change. Their purpose is twofold: first, their interest in a scientific investigation of change both descriptively and analytically and, secondly, their concern for using these materials to alter the scope, speed and perhaps directions of change in terms of explicit, normative criteria.

In this paper, they propose five major rubrics for the examination of structural change in American society. These five rubrics were subsequently explored in depth in their book, Indicators of Social Change: Concepts and Measurements (see No. 66). Thus, this paper is essentially a preliminary status report on their progress two years before the publication of the major work.

68. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Toward a Social Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Noting that there is no national and comprehensive set of statistics reflecting social progress (or retrogression), this report is a first step in the development of such a set. While the report has serious shortcomings, especially with respect to the scope of its purpose and the depth of its analysis of its subject areas, it is valuable as a preliminary statement on the thinking about social indicators at the federal level.

A set of social indicators is necessary to satisfy our curiosity as to our degree of well-being and to improve public policy making by illuminating existing social problems which enable more knowledgeable judgements about national priorities to be made and by providing insight into how various measures of national well-being are changing, thereby hopefully enabling more adequate evaluations of the accomplishments of public programs. With this as a base, Toward a Social Report attempts to discuss several areas of social life in terms of what information is presently available and what is needed. The seven areas discussed are: Health and Illness; Social Mobility; Our Physical Environment; Income and Poverty; Public Order and Safety; Learning, Science and Art; and Participation and Alienation.

The Appendix, entitled "How Can We Do Better Social Reporting in the Future?", is perhaps the most interesting section of the report. In it, the concept of social indicators is discussed and, more importantly, defined nicely as "a statistic of direct normative interest which facilitates concise, comprehensive and balanced judgments about the condition of major aspects of a society."

B. Societal Models

69. Belshaw, Cyril S. The Conditions of Social Performance. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Like Gross, Belshaw focuses upon the twin societal aspects, structure and performance, in his work to analyze society. He describes what each of these aspects entails, both apart and together and describes the processes affecting both within the social system. His primary task is to understand the process of "articulation" which he defines as "the various ways in which elements which make up culture react upon one another to bring about a further result."

70. Gross, Bertram M. "The Coming General Systems Models of Social Systems," Human Relations 20 (November, 1967), pp. 357-374.

Much of this article is a brief summary of the main aspects of the continuing trend toward social accounting and the prevailing types of social accounting. But one section of the paper, dealing with general reporting on social systems in terms of Gross" system structure-system performance model, specifically discusses an important attribute of social indicator systems, one which has not been covered in the literature to this extent. This attribute is the provision of "a conceptual and information basis for economically scanning the array of all possible kinds of relevant data and selecting those that are most relevant under specific circumstances." This scanning-selection process is related to evaluative criteria of past and present situations and trends, strategic objectives for present action and those areas involving by-products of present action.

71. Stanford Research Institute, Educational Policy Research Center. Toward Master Social Indicators. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, Research Memorandum EPRC 6747-2, February, 1969.

A heuristic model of society, in which goals, indicators and attainment levels are necessarily linked, is constructed in two parts; one, relating to the society and the other to the individual living in the society. A series of measures, from the most universal, through increasingly more specific indicators, to actual data, is related to each part. Within each measure level, a goal and various goal-attainment levels (optimum, standard,minimum) are specified.

Drawing on the HEW publication, Toward a Social Report, for its indicator areas, this paper presents possible attainment levels, subcategories and indicators, within the context of its societal model. While much of the data necessary to use this model is currently unavailable, the work entailed in this paper enabled the authors to define requirements --the requirements of a comprehensive social indicator system which could be used for descriptive social reporting, projective social trending and predictive social accounting.

72. Williams, Robin M. "A Model of Society---The American Case," in Bertram M. Gross (ed.), A Great Society? New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968, pp. 32-57.

The main intent of this article, in the author's words, is "to help in some small measure to prepare the way for actions in the near future, for the beginning of necessary reporting and analysis at the highest political levels." Toward this end, Williams lists three initial steps essential to the construction of a national system of social accounts: (1) the development of a detailed model of this social system; (2) the development of strategic sets of data with which to fill the model; and (3) the integration of economic, political, psychological and social models into one comprehensive model.

Taking as his goals his conception of what the Great Society will be, the author describes the directions and changes within the model as we progress towards that Great Society. Impediments (ideological, institutional, sociological and psychological) to these changes are also identified and described.

V. Appendix

The following entries have been listed as references in one or more of the annotated entries. Within the time constraints of this bibliography, it was impossible to locate and review them for inclusion in annotated form.

73. Biderman, Albert D. "Information--Intelligence--Enlightened Public Policy," Paper presented at the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

74. David, Paul T. "Index Numbers of Party Strength: National, State, and Local," Paper presented at the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

75. Drewnoski, Jan and Scott Wolf. The Level of Living Index. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Report No. 4, September, 1966. (Supplement: Programme II, November 27, 1968).

76. Ferriss, Abbott L. Indicators of Trends in American Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

77. Gilb, Corinne. "Can We Measure Beauty?" Paper presented at the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

78. Gottehrer, Barry. "A Human Information System for the Governing of New York City." Paper presented at the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

79. Gurin, Gerald, Joseph Veroff, and Sheila Feld. Americans View their Mental Health: A Nationwide Interview Survey. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

80. Holden, Matthew, Jr. "Indicators of Social Stress and Social Peace," Paper presented at the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

81. Krieger, Martin. "The Life Cycle as a Basis for Social Policy and Social Indicators," Berkeley: University of California Center for Planning and Development Research, October 16, 1969.

82. _____. "Social Indicators for the Quality of Individual Life," Berkeley: University of California Center for Planning and Development Research, October 16, 1969.

83. Moses, Stanley. "The Learning Force: An Approach to the Politics of Education," Paper presented at the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

84. Palley, Marion L. and Howard A. Palley. "Social Welfare Indicators as Predictors of Racial Disorders in Black Ghettos," Paper presented at the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969.

85. Porter, David O. "The Who and What of Future Forecasting in Politics," to be published in Albert Somit (ed.), Political Science and the Study of the Future. New York: Holt, Rinehart, 1971.

86. Wilson, John O. "Inequality of Racial Opportunity---An Excursion into the New Frontier of Socioeconomic Indicators." New Haven: Yale University Department of Economics, June, 1968.

87. _____. "Regional Differences in Social Welfare," Paper presented at the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, Ann Arbor, July, 1968.

Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography #215

SOCIAL INDICATORS

Additional copies available from:
Council of Planning Librarians
Exchange Bibliographies
Post Office Box 229
Monticello, Illinois 61856 for $4.50